UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/594,758	09/29/2006	Yoshihiro Nomura	296946US0PCT	5292
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET			EXAMINER	
			TSAY, MARSHA M	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1656	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/27/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/594,758	NOMURA ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Marsha M. Tsay	1656		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	l. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 Sec 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4-9 is/are withdrawn to 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or are subject to restriction and/or are subject to by the Examine 10) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the or specification is objected.	r election requirement. r. epted or b)⊡ objected to by the E drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		• •		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12.27.06; 05.01.07.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	te		

Claims 1-9 are pending. Claims 4-9 are withdrawn as being in improper form.

Priority: The request for priority to JAPAN 2004-107286, filed March 31, 2004, is acknowledged.

Claim Objections

Claims 4-9 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from other multiple dependent claims. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims have not been further treated on the merits.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: on page 1, the specification should be updated with a cross reference paragraph to priority applications.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 appears to be directed to a method of producing a keratin hydrolyzate. However, the preamble of claim 1 recites a process for producing solubilized keratin. The claim should be clarified and/or corrected to reflect what the instant process is really producing. Claim 1 recites regulating the water content of keratin raw material to a hydrous state of 20 to 80%. It is unclear how the water content is to be regulated.

Claim 1 recites the limitations "the water content", "the hydrolyzate liquid", "the supernatant" in the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Claim 2 recites a "cleaned" keratin raw material. It is unclear if by "cleaned", Applicants mean to say "purified." Further clarification is requested.

Claim 3 recites the limitation "the alkali concentration" in the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim and its parent claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiojima et al. (US 6066316). Shiojima et al. disclose pretreated and/or washed keratin (i.e., hair, wool, etc.) can be hydrolyzed by alkali solutions having a concentration between 1 to 20% in general (col. 22 lines 1-10, 39-40). Further, the hydrolysis reaction is conducted at room temperature to

Art Unit: 1656

100°C and for 30 minutes to 24 hours (col. 22 41-43). In Synthesizing Example 3(II) and (IV), Shiojima et al. disclose keratin raw material was immersed in aqueous solution, hydrolyzed in alkali solution, said keratin-alkali solution was neutralized, and filtered to obtain a keratin hydrolyzate (col. 28). Shiojima et al. do not explicitly teach a hydrous state of 20 to 80% or an alkali concentration of 0.1 to 0.5 mol/L.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Shiojima et al. by regulating the hydrous state of the keratin wool material to an appropriate degree (i.e., 20 to 80%) prior to hydrolysis with an optimum concentration of an alkali solution (i.e., 0.5 M sodium lauryl sulphate) in order to obtain a keratin hydrosylate (claims 1-3). Generally, differences in concentration or temperature will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration or temperature is critical. "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). Therefore, "the normal desire of scientists or artisans to improve upon what is already generally known provides the motivation to determine where in a disclosed set of percentage ranges is the optimum combination of percentages."); In re Hoeschele, 406 F.2d 1403, 160 USPQ 809 (CCPA 1969). For more recent cases applying this principle, see Merck & Co. Inc. v. Biocraft Laboratories Inc., 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ2d 1843 (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied, 493 U.S. 975 (1989); In re Kulling, 897 F.2d 1147, 14 USPQ2d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 1990); and In re Geisler. 116 F.3d 1465, 43 USPQ2d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 1997). MPEP 2144.05.

Application/Control Number: 10/594,758 Page 5

Art Unit: 1656

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marsha M. Tsay whose telephone number is (571)272-2938. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Kathleen Kerr Bragdon can be reached on 571-272-0931. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Maryam Monshipouri/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1656

August 21, 2008